

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant has presented arguments below that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendments and remarks to clarify issues upon appeal.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

Although the Examiner appears to have not included a specific indication of the rejection in the above-identified Office Action, based on the Examiner's response to Applicant's previous arguments, Applicant believes that the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jasuja et al. ("Jasuja"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections.

The present invention dynamically changes attributes in an embedded-SQL application with the provision of an option within a standard SQL statement for specifying one or more attributes of at least a declared cursor and the processing of the standard SQL statement to include the one or more attributes in the at least declared cursor. See independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Applicant recites more particularly that the option is provided as an ATTRIBUTES option within a PREPARE SQL statement. See dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17. In this manner, attributes of a cursor may be dynamically changed without requiring declaration of a

new cursor or the introduction of a new SQL statement. Applicant illustrates this ability in the SQL examples in the specification from page 8, line 18 to page 10, line 9. Applicant fails to see anything in the Jasuja reference that teaches or suggests the ability to provide attributes of a declared cursor in a standard SQL statement and/or the ability to process the standard SQL statement to include the attributes in the declared cursor.

The cited art of Jasuja is concerned with reducing database memory requirements for storing descriptors for bind variables of cursors. Bind variables are described as the input variables or parameterized values of a predicate of a query that when changed, change the rows returned by the query (see col. 2, lines 2-20). Jasuja teaches that “bind variable descriptors are data describing attributes (e.g., the data types, lengths, precision, scale, etc., but not the values) of the bind variables” (col. 3, lines 14-17). The aim in Jasuja is to change how bind variable descriptors are maintained by only maintaining them in shared cursor objects and not in instantiation objects.

While reducing memory requirements in database systems is a concern in Jasuja and the present invention, the issue addressed by Jasuja regarding a change in how bind variable descriptors are maintained fails to teach, show, or suggest the present invention, which addresses aspects of specifying attributes of a declared cursor to dynamically change the attributes. In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that the Jasuja reference is silent regarding cursor attributes and thus offers no teaching or suggestion as to how attributes of a declared cursor could or would be specified and processed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Jasuja wholly fails to teach or suggest providing an option within a standard SQL statement for specifying one or more attributes of at least a declared cursor and processing the standard SQL statement to include the

specified one or more attributes in the at least declared cursor, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. More particularly, Jasuja wholly fails to teach, show, or suggest an ATTRIBUTES option provided within a PREPARE SQL statement, as recited in dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17.

In response to these arguments by the Applicant, the Examiner states:

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Jasuja suggests, “pseudo SQL statements and corresponding pseudo PL/SQL statement, which when executed by a client, cause a cursor to be created. Of course, additional statements could be intermixed with the exemplary statements shown in Table 3 (col. 8, lines 54-56). This teaches the cursor is created dynamically wherein which is the better system than the present [sic] wherein the user specifying the attributes for the declared cursor.

By the Examiner's arguments, Jasuja's pseudo SQL statements and corresponding pseudo PL/SQL statements cause a cursor to be created. The Applicant's recited invention, however, concerns how attributes of a declared cursor are dynamically changed through an option provided in a standard SQL statement. Applicant fails to see how the creation of a cursor teaches or suggests dynamically changing attributes of a declared cursor and respectfully reiterates that Jasuja is silent regarding attributes of a declared cursor. Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner has cited nothing from Jasuja that indicates anything contrary to Applicant's position regarding the silence of Jasuja concerning attributes of a declared cursor. Accordingly, without further criticality of teaching, Applicant respectfully submits that even the pseudo SQL statements or pseudo PL/SQL statements of Table 3 of Jasuja for cursor creation offer no teaching or suggestion of the dynamic changing of attributes of a declared cursor through an option provided in a standard SQL statement, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

Furthermore, while the Examiner states that all dependent claims are rejected under the same reasons as independent claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that a blanket

statement such as this fails to provide sufficient basis for the anticipatory rejection of these claims. With particular regard, Applicant reiterates that Jasuja wholly fails to teach, show, or suggest an ATTRIBUTES option provided within a PREPARE SQL statement, as recited in dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17. As such, Applicant fails to see how these dependent claims can be rejected under the same reasons as independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over the cited art. Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-20 also depend directly or indirectly on an independent claim, thus incorporating at least the features of an independent claim while adding further features. Therefore, these claims are respectfully submitted as allowable for at least those reasons presented hereinabove with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

May 10, 2004
Date



Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540